

Understanding the Impact of Confidence in Retrieval Augmented Generation: A Case Study in the Medical Domain

Shintaro Ozaki¹ Yuta Kato² Siyuan Feng² Masayo Tomita² Kazuki Hayashi¹ Ryoma Obara³

Masafumi Oyamada³ Katsuhiko Hayashi² Hidetaka Kamigaito¹ Taro Watanabe¹

¹Nara Institute of Science and Technology ²The University of Tokyo ³NEC Corporation

ozaki.shintaro.ou6@naist.ac.jp {ryoma-obara, oyamada}@nec.com

{hayashi.kazuki.hl4, kamigaito.h, taro}@is.naist.jp

{ukato6209, 9445233883, tomita-masayo732, katsuhiko-hayashi}@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract

Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) complements the knowledge of Large Language Models (LLMs) by leveraging external information to enhance response accuracy for queries. This approach is widely applied in several fields by taking its advantage of injecting the most up-to-date information, and researchers are focusing on understanding and improving this aspect to unlock the full potential of RAG in such high-stakes applications. However, despite the potential of RAG to address these needs, the mechanisms behind the confidence levels of its outputs remain underexplored, although the confidence of information is very critical in some domains, such as finance, healthcare, and medicine. Our study focuses the impact of RAG on confidence within the medical domain under various configurations and models. We evaluate confidence by treating the model’s predicted probability as its output and calculating Expected Calibration Error (ECE) and Adaptive Calibration Error (ACE) scores based on the probabilities and accuracy. In addition, we analyze whether the order of retrieved documents within prompts calibrates the confidence. Our findings reveal large variation in confidence and accuracy depending on the model, settings, and the format of input prompts. These results underscore the necessity of optimizing configurations based on the specific model and conditions.¹

1 Introduction

Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) (Lewis et al., 2020) serves as a method to supplement the knowledge of Large Language Models (LLMs) (Achiam et al., 2023; Team et al., 2024; Dubey et al., 2024). By leveraging external information, RAG enhances response accuracy and alignment with queries, making it widely appli-

¹The code is available at https://anonymized_for_review.




Figure 1: The focus of our research is to analyze whether RAG improves the confidence of the model response.

cable in industries. Notable domains include finance (Yepes et al., 2024; Setty et al., 2024) and healthcare (Xiong et al., 2024), where the confidence of information is critical. Recently, it has also been integrated into search engines to improve user experience.

While researchers actively explore performance improvements for LLMs using RAG, analyses focusing on the confidence of outputs remain limited, as shown in Figure 1. Although RAG enhances answer accuracy, it may also lead to overconfidence, where models exhibit unwarranted self-assurance. Our hypothesis is “retrieving documents to support the correct answer through RAG enhance model confidence.” Based on this hypothesis, we define two research questions (RQs) to analyze the impact into confidence under RAG. For **RQ1**, we focused on the medical domain, employing multiple tasks and datasets to serve as document stores (vector-

store) and evaluating them with various models. Moreover, we further validate the factors such as the number of model parameters, the number of retrieved documents (top-k), and the embedding size during index creation affect performance. As for **RQ2**, we analyzed how the placement of retrieved documents within a prompt influences the relationship between confidence and accuracy, e.g., inserting documents before the question or after the answer choices. This examination is inspired by “Lost in the Middle” (Liu et al., 2024), a phenomenon where models overlook the information in the middle of long prompts. We further made an analysis by systematically simulating diverse scenarios under RAG through manipulating the document content, such as including irrelevant documents or exclusively providing those directly related to the answer, to simulate diverse scenarios RAG encounters.

The results on medical datasets of MedMCQA (Pal et al., 2022), MedQA (Jin et al., 2020), PubMedQA, (Jin et al., 2019), and the medical question part of MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021b,a) revealed that variations in configuration, such as the retriever model, the inference model, and other conditions, have an impact on the confidence of the output. Notably, we found instances where RAG introduces noise, while reducing confidence on some cases. This variation underscores that RAG can lower both confidence and accuracy under certain configurations. Additionally, the format of input prompts influenced outputs, highlighting that the optimal settings for confidence vary considerably across models and configurations. From an accuracy perspective, performance improved when deliberately providing relevant documents as answers but declined when inserting only irrelevant documents. These findings indicate that careful selection of documents is crucial for the confidence of outputs, contradicting our initial hypothesis that retrieving documents to support the correct answer.

2 Related Work

Research with Confidence Research on confidence has been prevalent since before the era of LLMs (Jiang et al., 2021) and continues to be extensively explored (Geng et al., 2024). Becker and Soatto (2024) proposed a framework that measures confidence by leveraging explanation-generating text produced by LLMs. Zhao et al. (2021) identified the issue that few-shot prompting significantly

impacts model confidence and alters its inherent performance, and they proposed methods to address this problem. Confidence is also employed as a technique to suppress hallucinations, where models generate false information (Zhang et al., 2023). Cole et al. (2023) demonstrated that by utilizing model confidence, it is possible to suppress outputs for ambiguous questions. This finding suggests that leveraging model confidence can improve performance in ambiguous QA scenarios. Our study focuses on confidence in RAG and analyzes whether the confidence of LLM outputs improves when retrieving questions and related documents from external sources.

Improving Performance with RAG Using Confidence Recent advances in RAG have leveraged model confidence (e.g., output probability) to optimize retrieval and generation processes. For instance, Jiang et al. (2023) introduced FLARE, which dynamically decides whether to retrieve additional information based on token-level confidence during generation, ensuring efficient retrieval by minimizing unnecessary searches. Similarly, query rewriting techniques using reinforcement learning (Ma et al., 2023) and strategies such as Recitation-Augmented Generation (Sun et al., 2023), which searches for text resembling hypothetical answers, have shown promise in enhancing retrieval accuracy. Moreover, recent studies like Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2023) integrate retrieval into the generation process itself. In many of these approaches, confidence plays a crucial role either in deciding when to retrieve or in re-ranking retrieved documents based on their relevance. However, these studies focus on improving RAG performance without analyzing how confidence itself is influenced by the RAG. Specifically, while confidence thresholds and re-ranking mechanisms are employed to optimize retrieval and generation, the underlying dynamics of confidence calibration within the RAG pipeline remain underexplored. Our study analyzes confidence calibration with and without RAG to address this gap, verify the implicit assumptions of prior works, and contribute to a deeper understanding of confidence-based mechanisms in RAG.

3 Methods

Our study analyzes whether the confidence is calibrated through RAG by calculating the model’s confidence from the probability predicted by the

model. Each input is formatted by concatenating a question prompt with its answer options (e.g., a four-choice question) by following the design of Medical Information Retrieval Augmented Generation Evaluation (MIRAGE) (Xiong et al., 2024). For prompts, our study employs the prompt namely “Prompt w/o RAG” in Table 2 when RAG is not used, and the prompt called “Prompt w/ RAG” with Pre-Question which means concatenating the document before the question when RAG is applied in RQ1. Directly generating the choice answer by the model complicates evaluation, as differences in reported metrics arise even under identical conditions across studies (Xiong et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2024). In our study, we predict the most plausible option from the given choices as follows:

$$v_i = \log P(x_i | \text{prompt}) \quad (1)$$

$$P(x_i) = \frac{\exp(v_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^J \exp(v_j)}, \quad (2)$$

where v_i represents the log probability corresponding to each choice x_i and the prompt refers to the provided question or context. $P(x_i)$ denotes the probability that the choice x_i is the correct answer, normalized by dividing the exponential of v_i by the sum of exponentials of all v_j values, while J is the number of options, which is 3 or 4 in this work.

Our study further analyzes the optimal position for inserting documents retrieved via RAG into the model input, as outlined in RQ2. Specifically, we evaluate three insertion patterns: (Pre-Question, denote as Pre-Q) before the question, (After-Question, denote as Aft-Q) between the question and the answer choices, and (After-Choice, denote as Aft-C) after the answer choices. Moreover, in order to focus on the impact of retrieved document positions, we use documents that contain the correct answer to the question. We follow the evaluation design of the MedMCQA dataset which includes both questions and explanations, and validate our research question under three scenarios: (1) inserting only the explanation related to the answer (denote as Ans1), (2) combining the correct explanation with two irrelevant documents (denote as A1-O2), and (3) inserting three irrelevant documents (denote as Oth3). The irrelevant documents are derived from unrelated questions and are carefully selected to exclude any occurrence of the correct answer string in their content.

Dataset	Size	Option	Use
MedMCQA	4,183	4	
MedQA	1,273	4	
MMLU	1,089	4	RQ1
PubMedQA	500	3	
MedMCQA (Extract)	2,206	4	RQ2

Table 1: Each QA dataset size. All datasets have been filtered to include only those related to the medical domain. For MedMCQA, used in RQ2, only questions that include explanation of the evidence are selected. We described the details in Appendix A.1.

Configuration	Parameter
Models	{Phi-3.5, PMC-LLaMA, MEDITRON, LLaMA2/3.1}
Retriever Models	{MedCPT, Contriever, SPECTER, BM25}
Embedding Size	{256, 512}
Top	{1, 3}

Table 2: We analyze how the combination of models and parameters, embedding sizes, the number of retrieved documents, and retriever models affect confidence. The confidence is calculated for all possible combinations of these factors.

4 Experimental Setup

Datasets Our study focuses on the application of RAG in the medical domain. Following the experimental setup of MIRAGE (Xiong et al., 2024), the QA datasets come from MedMCQA (Pal et al., 2022), MedQA (Jin et al., 2020), PubMedQA (Jin et al., 2019), and MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021b,a) as shown in Table 1. For MMLU, only questions related to the medical domain are utilized. MedMCQA includes text supporting the correct answer for each question, and thus, we use the dataset to create pseudo-RAG by treating the text as the correct documents when investigating RQ2.

Inference Models We selected the following models for evaluation: Phi-3.5 (3.8B) (Abdin et al., 2024), PMC-LLaMA (13B) (Wu et al., 2024), LLaMA2 (70B) (Touvron et al., 2023b), LLaMA3 (70B) (Dubey et al., 2024), and MEDITRON (70B) (Chen et al., 2023). PMC-LLaMA is fine-tuned on medical domain documents based on LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023a), while MEDITRON is continual pre-trained on




Figure 2: For the templates, Prompt w/o RAG and Prompt w/ RAG (Pre-Question) are used for RQ1, while Prompt w/ RAG is used for RQ2. Each prompt begins with a concatenated of the system prompt. Following MIRAGE (Xiong et al., 2024), we designed the templates to enable the calculation of probabilities.

LLaMA2 (Touvron et al., 2023b). For 70B models, we applied 4-bit quantization, and for PMC-LLaMA, we used half-precision quantization to compute probabilities. Detailed model configurations are described in Appendix A.2.

Documents For the documents in the datastore, we selected StatPearls² and Textbooks (Jin et al., 2021). These sources contain medical domain documents, and we utilized the dataset published by Xiong et al. (2024)³. We adopted combinations of embedding sizes (256 and 512 tokens) and retrieval configurations (top-1 and top-3 documents). This setup aims to analyze whether confidence levels vary depending on the RAG configuration. Detailed combinations are provided in Table 2.

Templates In our study, we modified the approach based on the MIRAGE paper to exclude Chain of Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022), enabling direct computation of the probabilities. For RQ1, we utilized the templates specified in Figure 2, employing (Prompt w/o RAG) without RAG and (Prompt w/ RAG) with Pre-Question for RAG-based setups. Additionally, in RQ2, to observe behavioral differences based on the insertion order

²<https://www.statpearls.com/>

³<https://huggingface.co/MedRAG>

of documents, we prepared three patterns similar to (Prompt w/ RAG) in Figure 2. For both RQ1 and RQ2, we concatenated a system prompt to the beginning of each prompt.

RAG Settings For retriever models, we selected MedCPT (Jin et al., 2023), Contriever (Izacard et al., 2021), SPECTER (Cohan et al., 2020), and BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009; Lù, 2024). To analyze further detailed confidence, we varied the embedding size (256 and 512) for dense retriever models and analyzed combinations of top-1 and top-3 retrieved documents. When creating the index, the chunk size was set to 1000, and the overlap to 50. The dense model uses the inner product (IP) as the distance function, describing the details in Table 7 on Appendix. We represent the combinations of the number of documents retrieved and the embedding sizes as T1-256, T1-512, T3-256, and T3-512, providing details in Table 2.

Evaluation Methods Our study evaluates confidence using ECE and ACE. The lower these values are, the more reliable the model is.

(1) **Expected Calibration Error (ECE)** (Naeini et al., 2015; Guo et al., 2017) measures the gap between a model’s predicted probabilities and the actual accuracy. It divides the range of predicted probabilities into several bins and calculates the difference between them and the observed accuracy within each bin as follows:

$$ECE = \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{|B_m|}{n} |\text{acc}(B_m) - \text{conf}(B_m)| \quad (3)$$

Here, M denotes the number of bins, B_m represents the set of samples within bin m , $|B_m|$ is the number of samples in bin m , and n is the total number of samples. $\text{acc}(B_m)$ refers to the accuracy within bin B_m , while $\text{conf}(B_m)$ indicates the predicted confidence. ECE is computed as the weighted average of the absolute differences between the accuracy and confidence across bins, where the weights correspond to the proportion of samples in each bin.

(2) **Adaptive Calibration Error (ACE)** (Nixon et al., 2019) is a metric proposed to address the shortcomings of ECE, specifically aiming to reduce the risk of bins with a small number of samples. ACE performs binning so that the number of samples in each bin remains constant. This approach ensures a more stable evaluation of calibration error




Figure 3: The confidence calibration curve, where the line $y = x$ represents perfect. The x-axis indicates the predicted probabilities, while the y-axis shows the accuracy of predictions within each bin, the size setting to 20. When using LLaMA3.1 on MMLU, the result shows that applying RAG improves the confidence compared to w/o RAG.




Figure 4: The confidence calibration curve using Phi-3.5 on MMLU, the result shows that applying RAG improves the confidence compared to w/o RAG.

within each bin:

$$ACE = \frac{1}{KR} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{r=1}^R |\text{acc}(r, k) - \text{conf}(r, k)| \quad (4)$$

Here, K denotes the number of classes, R represents the number of bins, $\text{acc}(r, k)$ indicates the accuracy in bin r for class k , and $\text{conf}(r, k)$ denotes the confidence of predictions in the same bin and class. In our study, we analyze the model’s confidence in terms of ECE and ACE; the closer the values of ECE and ACE are to zero, the more ideal the output can be taken to be.

5 Results

RQ1 Table 3 shows the results of evaluating whether the confidence is calibrated through RAG. We denote the combinations of the number of retrieval documents (Top-k) and the embedding sizes (256 or 512 length) as T1-256, T1-512, T3-256, and T3-512. For ECE, LLaMA3.1 demonstrates improved confidence on MMLU, while




Figure 5: The results of LLaMA2 on PubMedQA. The x-axis represents the accuracy, while the y-axis indicates the ECE. The line $y = -x$ represents perfect. Ideally, the baseline, marked as \star , appears in the top-left corner, with configurations incorporating RAG appearing toward the bottom-right.




Figure 6: Results of MEDITRON on PubMedQA.

the other models show deterioration. Regarding ACE, Phi-3.5 exhibits slight improvement, though the effect is minimal. Figures 3 and 4 visualize the confidence calibration curve. On MMLU, RAG causes LLaMA3.1 to become overconfident, whereas Phi-3.5 becomes underconfident. These results show that the same task behaves very differently depending on the model.

RQ2 Tables 4 and 5 show the impact of changing the order of inserting retrieval in a template on confidence behavior. The prompt patterns follow Figure 2, where Pre-Q, Aft-Q, and Aft-C represent Pre-Question, After-Question, and After-Choice, respectively. Ans1 includes only the correct explanation, A1-O2 combines the correct text with two irrelevant documents, and Oth3 consists entirely of three irrelevant documents. Contrary to our hypothesis, when documents were deliberately inserted, not all models exhibited reductions in ECE or ACE. Furthermore, models that showed increased the accuracy also demonstrated decreases in ECE.

MMLU												
Model	Retriever	Index	ECE ↓					ACE ↓				
			None	T1-256	T1-512	T3-256	T3-512	None	T1-256	T1-512	T3-256	T3-512
Phi-3.5	w/o RAG	-	0.14	-	-	-	-	0.18	-	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.11	-	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.12
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
	Contriever	statpearls	-	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	-	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18
		textbooks	-	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.16	-	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.17	-	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.17
		textbooks	-	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.17	-	0.17	0.18	0.17	0.17
	BM25	statpearls	-	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.17	-	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.17
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.17	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
	PMC-LLaMA	w/o RAG	-	0.08	-	-	-	-	0.07	-	-	-
MedCPT		statpearls	-	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.11	-	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.12
		textbooks	-	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.11	-	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.10
Contriever		statpearls	-	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.11	-	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
		textbooks	-	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	-	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.12
SPECTER		statpearls	-	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	-	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11
		textbooks	-	0.10	0.10	0.12	0.12	-	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.12
BM25		statpearls	-	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	-	0.19	0.19	0.20	0.20
		textbooks	-	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	-	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
LLaMA-3.1		w/o RAG	-	0.32	-	-	-	-	0.32	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	-	0.24	0.24	0.23	0.23
		textbooks	-	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	-	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24
	Contriever	statpearls	-	0.24	0.24	0.25	0.25	-	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24
		textbooks	-	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	-	0.24	0.23	0.24	0.24
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	-	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24
		textbooks	-	0.25	0.25	0.26	0.26	-	0.24	0.24	0.25	0.24
	BM25	statpearls	-	0.24	0.24	0.25	0.25	-	0.23	0.23	0.24	0.24
		textbooks	-	0.25	0.25	0.34	0.34	-	0.24	0.24	0.34	0.34
	MEDITRON	w/o RAG	-	0.05	-	-	-	-	0.05	-	-	-
MedCPT		statpearls	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
Contriever		statpearls	-	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.17	-	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.16
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	-	0.15	0.16	0.15	0.15
SPECTER		statpearls	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	-	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15
		textbooks	-	0.14	0.14	0.16	0.16	-	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.15
BM25		statpearls	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	-	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.15
LLaMA-2		w/o RAG	-	0.11	-	-	-	-	0.11	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15	-	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.14
		textbooks	-	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15	-	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.14
	Contriever	statpearls	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	-	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.14
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	-	0.15	0.14	0.15	0.15
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
		textbooks	-	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.13	-	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.12
	BM25	statpearls	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	-	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.14
		textbooks	-	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.14	-	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.14

Table 3: The RQ1 results of the confidence w/ and w/o RAG on MMLU. Value indicates cases where the confidence worsened, whereas Value denotes cases where the confidence improved. T1 and T3 indicate the retrieval of the Top1 and Top3 documents, respectively. Additionally, 256 and 512 represent the embedding size used during the index creation phase.

MedMCQA (Extract)					
Model	Pattern	Accuracy \uparrow			
		None	Ans1	A1-O2	Oth3
Phi-3.5	w/o RAG	51.52	-	-	-
	Pre-Q	-	86.08	84.95	51.81
	Aft-Q	-	88.49	85.95	39.39
	Aft-C	-	87.35	76.11	44.33
PMC-LLaMA	w/o RAG	38.11	-	-	-
	Pre-Q	-	32.73	31.64	26.97
	Aft-Q	-	32.91	30.01	26.97
	Aft-C	-	33.45	28.74	28.06
LLaMA-3.1	w/o RAG	58.98	-	-	-
	Pre-Q	-	20.90	20.94	20.94
	Aft-Q	-	20.90	20.90	20.94
	Aft-C	-	20.94	20.94	20.94
MEDITRON	w/o RAG	35.52	-	-	-
	Pre-Q	-	67.72	54.03	36.04
	Aft-Q	-	66.68	47.14	31.96
	Aft-C	-	62.83	34.18	31.91
LLaMA-2	w/o RAG	38.32	-	-	-
	Pre-Q	-	72.57	75.34	32.09
	Aft-Q	-	75.57	69.63	28.11
	Aft-C	-	67.50	60.74	28.88

Table 4: The results of RQ2 on MedMCQA show the accuracy under different configurations. Values indicate cases where the accuracy improved compared to w/o RAG, while values indicate cases where the accuracy decreased. Values represent the highest accuracy.

6 Analysis & Discussion

6.1 RQ1: Does RAG Affect the confidence calibration?

The results on MMLU in Table 3 reveals that the impact of RAG on the confidence calibration varies across models. For LLaMA3.1, RAG reduces both ECE and ACE, indicating an improvement in the confidence calibration. However, the same analysis on other models under identical settings shows that ECE deteriorates across the board. This suggests that RAG requires careful configuration from the perspective of the confidence calibration. Table 8 in Appendix details the accuracy results, highlighting that the optimal configuration for the accuracy often differs largely from those for ECE and ACE. Results for other datasets, including MedQA, MedMCQA, and PubMedQA, are provided in Tables 9, 10, and 11 of Appendix, respectively. Figures 3 and 4 display the confidence calibration curves, with the number of bins set to 20. While these results suggest that RAG appears to calibrate the

confidence, the inference behavior of the models varies largely, indicating distinct characteristics inherent to each LLM. For instance, in our study, LLaMA3.1 demonstrates underconfidence, whereas Phi-3.5 exhibits overconfidence.

6.2 RQ1: The Influence about the Detailed Settings on RAG

We observed that the combination of retriever models, inference models, and the number of retrieved documents, also impacts model behavior. Specifically, while retrieving more documents with RAG provides access to diverse information, it can lead to declines in both accuracy and confidence. This suggests that model is forgetting the more of its inherent knowledge due by the more retrieval of documents during RAG. Considering the combination of the accuracy results detailed in Table 8 of Appendix, we confirmed a trade-off between the increase in the accuracy and the reduction in the confidence errors. For example, while the accuracy improved for PMC-LLaMA, its ECE got worse. LLaMA3.1 achieved a reduction in ECE but at the cost of decreased the accuracy. These observations indicate the optimal configuration depends on the specific case and the aspect prioritized, whether it be the accuracy or the confidence calibration.

6.3 RQ2: Which Template Performs the best for Confidence?

The results on how the insertion position of documents affects confidence suggest placing documents after the choices (Aft-C) in Table 5 appears to be the optimal approach for improving confidence. However, from the perspective of the accuracy, this pattern yields the lowest performance among all patterns, further experiment supporting a trade-off between the accuracy and confidence.

6.4 RQ2: The Impact of the Document that has an Answer?

We observed that inserting documents with deliberately included correct answers improved the accuracy. This indicates that RAG enhances accuracy as long as it retrieves at least one document containing the correct rationale, aligning with the findings of Leto et al. (2024). On the other hand, when only irrelevant documents we described in Section 3 were included, Table 5 shows a sharp increase in the calibration error for Phi-3.5. In Table 5, Ans1, A1-O2, and Oth3 represent the following conditions: only the document explaining the correct answer was

MedMCQA (Extract)									
Model	Pattern	ECE ↓				ACE ↓			
		None	Ans1	A1-O2	Oth3	None	Ans1	A1-O2	Oth3
Phi-3.5	w/o RAG	0.05	-	-	-	0.06	-	-	-
	Pre-Q	-	0.06	0.07	0.32	-	0.10	0.10	0.34
	Aft-Q	-	0.04	0.06	0.42	-	0.08	0.09	0.43
	Aft-C	-	0.04	0.13	0.41	-	0.08	0.16	0.42
PMC-LLaMA	w/o RAG	0.16	-	-	-	0.16	-	-	-
	Pre-Q	-	0.01	0.01	0.04	-	0.05	0.04	0.04
	Aft-Q	-	0.01	0.02	0.06	-	0.04	0.03	0.05
	Aft-C	-	0.02	0.05	0.05	-	0.03	0.04	0.04
LLaMA-3.1	w/o RAG	0.20	-	-	-	0.20	-	-	-
	Pre-Q	-	0.14	0.14	0.14	-	0.11	0.12	0.12
	Aft-Q	-	0.14	0.14	0.14	-	0.12	0.12	0.12
	Aft-C	-	0.14	0.14	0.14	-	0.12	0.12	0.12
MEDITRON	w/o RAG	0.07	-	-	-	0.06	-	-	-
	Pre-Q	-	0.18	0.08	0.09	-	0.18	0.08	0.09
	Aft-Q	-	0.16	0.09	0.15	-	0.16	0.09	0.15
	Aft-C	-	0.15	0.07	0.09	-	0.15	0.07	0.09
LLaMA-2	w/o RAG	0.02	-	-	-	0.02	-	-	-
	Pre-Q	-	0.22	0.25	0.08	-	0.22	0.25	0.07
	Aft-Q	-	0.24	0.21	0.12	-	0.24	0.21	0.11
	Aft-C	-	0.20	0.17	0.10	-	0.20	0.18	0.10

Table 5: The results of RQ2 on MedMCQA for ECE and ACE. Ans1, A1-O2, and Oth3 indicate inserting only the explanation related to the answer, combining the explanation with two noisy documents, and inserting three noisy documents, respectively. Pattern indicates the order of the prompt, as shown in Figure 2. Values indicate cases where the ECE/ACE improved compared to w/o RAG, while values indicate cases where the ECE/ACE worsened.

included, one correct document and two irrelevant documents were included, and only three irrelevant documents were included, respectively. This suggests that models with fewer parameters can be confused by irrelevant inputs, disrupting their internal knowledge. Conversely, larger parameter, 70B models demonstrate the ability to judge whether retrieved documents are irrelevant, maintaining their confidence under such conditions.

7 Conclusion

In our study, we analyzed whether RAG calibrates the confidence using the probabilities (RQ1), hypothesizing that RAG calibrates the confidence of the LLMs. We further analyzed the potential occurrence of the Lost in the Middle, a phenomenon

where models overlook the information, in RAG by analyzing how the position of retrieved documents in the prompt template affects confidence and accuracy (RQ2). The results of RQ1 revealed that RAG’s behavior is highly sensitive to the inference model, retriever model, and configuration, underscoring the need for careful selection of appropriate settings. Moreover, the parameter size of LLMs affect largely the ECE and ACE. In RQ2, we observed that the confidence decreased when the accuracy increased, and confidence increased when accuracy decreased, confirming a trade-off relationship. Since the optimal decision varies depending on the situation, these findings highlight the importance of carefully selecting documents when implementing RAG.

8 Limitations

8.1 The Experiments of the Other Domain

Our study prioritizes domains where RAG is applied, focusing specifically on the medical domain to analyze confidence. To advance further, it becomes necessary to validate RAG in domains such as finance and analyze its confidence in contexts requiring highly reliable information.

8.2 Further Analyzing New RAG Architecture

Our study focused exclusively on analyzing the basic RAG architecture. While the standard RAG framework directly utilizes retrieved documents within the LLM, newer RAG architectures incorporate various control mechanisms. Moving forward, it is essential to analyze these advanced architectures from the perspective of confidence as well.

9 Ethical Considerations

9.1 The Possibility of Dataset Bias

The datasets and retrieval mechanisms employed in our study may carry inherent biases, which could influence the model’s predictions and potentially affect fairness in decision-making. Recognizing these biases, we advocate for the use of diverse and representative datasets to minimize their impact. Additionally, we uphold transparency by analyzing the interplay between confidence and accuracy, providing users with clearer insights into the system’s limitations and confidence. However, we emphasize the need for human oversight, as no automated system can guarantee infallibility.

9.2 AI Assistant Tools

We used ChatGPT⁴ and DeepL⁵ to translate sentences to English and accelerate our research.

References

Marah Abidin, Jyoti Aneja, Hany Awadalla, Ahmed Awadallah, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Jianmin Bao, Harkirat Behl, et al. 2024. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219*.

Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.

⁴<https://chatgpt.com/>

⁵<https://www.deepl.com/ja/translator>

Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11511*.

Evan Becker and Stefano Soatto. 2024. *Cycles of thought: Measuring llm confidence through stable explanations*. Preprint, arXiv:2406.03441.

Zeming Chen, Alejandro Hernández Cano, Angelika Romanou, Antoine Bonnet, Kyle Matoba, Francesco Salvi, Matteo Pagliardini, Simin Fan, Andreas Köpf, Amirkeivan Mohtashami, Alexandre Sallinen, Alireza Sakhaeirad, Vinitra Swamy, Igor Krawczuk, Deniz Bayazit, Axel Marmet, Syrielle Montariol, Mary-Anne Hartley, Martin Jaggi, and Antoine Bosselut. 2023. *Meditron-70b: Scaling medical pretraining for large language models*. Preprint, arXiv:2311.16079.

Arman Cohan, Sergey Feldman, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Daniel S. Weld. 2020. SPECTER: Document-level Representation Learning using Citation-informed Transformers. In *ACL*.

Jeremy Cole, Michael Zhang, Daniel Gillick, Julian Eisenschlos, Bhuwan Dhingra, and Jacob Eisenstein. 2023. *Selectively answering ambiguous questions*. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 530–543, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Tim Dettmers, Mike Lewis, Younes Belkada, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Gpt3. int8 (): 8-bit matrix multiplication for transformers at scale. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30318–30332.

Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.

Jiahui Geng, Fengyu Cai, Yuxia Wang, Heinz Koepl, Preslav Nakov, and Iryna Gurevych. 2024. *A survey of confidence estimation and calibration in large language models*. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6577–6595, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. 2017. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR.

Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andrew Critch, Jerry Li, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021a. Aligning ai with shared human values. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021b. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2021. Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning.
- Zhengbao Jiang, Jun Araki, Haibo Ding, and Graham Neubig. 2021. How can we know when language models know? on the calibration of language models for question answering. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:962–977.
- Zhengbao Jiang, Frank Xu, Luyu Gao, Zhiqing Sun, Qian Liu, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Active retrieval augmented generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7969–7992, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. 2020. What disease does this patient have. *A Large-scale Open Domain Question Answering Dataset from Medical Exams*. *arXiv [cs. CL]*.
- Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. 2021. What disease does this patient have? a large-scale open domain question answering dataset from medical exams. *Applied Sciences*, 11(14):6421.
- Qiao Jin, Bhuwan Dhingra, Zhengping Liu, William Cohen, and Xinghua Lu. 2019. PubMedQA: A dataset for biomedical research question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 2567–2577, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qiao Jin, Won Kim, Qingyu Chen, Donald C Comeau, Lana Yeganova, W John Wilbur, and Zhiyong Lu. 2023. Medcpt: Contrastive pre-trained transformers with large-scale pubmed search logs for zero-shot biomedical information retrieval. *Bioinformatics*, 39(11):btad651.
- Alexandria Leto, Cecilia Aguerrebere, Ishwar Bhati, Ted Willke, Mariano Tepper, and Vy Ai Vo. 2024. Toward optimal search and retrieval for rag. *Preprint*, arXiv:2411.07396.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474.
- Nelson F. Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranajpe, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. 2024. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173.
- Xing Han Lù. 2024. Bm25s: Orders of magnitude faster lexical search via eager sparse scoring. *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.03618.
- Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. 2023. Query rewriting in retrieval-augmented large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5303–5315, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mahdi Pakdaman Naeni, Gregory F Cooper, and Milos Hauskrecht. 2015. Obtaining well calibrated probabilities using bayesian binning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 2901–2907.
- Jeremy Nixon, Michael W. Dusenberry, Linchuan Zhang, Ghassen Jerfel, and Dustin Tran. 2019. Measuring calibration in deep learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshops*.
- Ankit Pal, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, and Malaikannan Sankarasubbu. 2022. Medmcqa: A large-scale multi-subject multi-choice dataset for medical domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning*, volume 174 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 248–260. PMLR.
- Stephen Robertson, Hugo Zaragoza, et al. 2009. The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 3(4):333–389.
- Spurthi Setty, Harsh Thakkar, Alyssa Lee, Eden Chung, and Natan Vidra. 2024. Improving retrieval for rag based question answering models on financial documents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07221*.
- Zhiqing Sun, Xuezhi Wang, Yi Tay, Yiming Yang, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Recitation-augmented language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Gemini Team, Petko Georgiev, Ving Ian Lei, Ryan Burnell, Libin Bai, Anmol Gulati, Garrett Tanzer, Damien Vincent, Zhufeng Pan, Shibo Wang, et al. 2024. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023a. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.

Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023b. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.09288.

Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.

Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. [Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Chaoyi Wu, Weixiong Lin, Xiaoman Zhang, Ya Zhang, Weidi Xie, and Yanfeng Wang. 2024. [Pmc-llama: toward building open-source language models for medicine](#).

Guangzhi Xiong, Qiao Jin, Zhiyong Lu, and Aidong Zhang. 2024. [Benchmarking retrieval-augmented generation for medicine](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 6233–6251, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Antonio Jimeno Yepes, Yao You, Jan Milczek, Sebastian Laverde, and Renyu Li. 2024. Financial report chunking for effective retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05131*.

Jiaxin Zhang, Zhuohang Li, Kamalika Das, Bradley Malin, and Sricharan Kumar. 2023. [SAC³: Reliable hallucination detection in black-box language models](#)

[via semantic-aware cross-check consistency](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 15445–15458, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Zihao Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. 2021. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 12697–12706. PMLR.

A Appendix

A.1 Dataset Selection

Since the test set for MedMCQA is not publicly available, our study used the dev set as the test set, following the approach adopted in MIRAGE.⁶ We used the datasets, especially MedQA⁷, MedMCQA⁸, PubMedQA⁹, MMLU¹⁰ respectively.

A.2 Detailed Parameters

As for BM25, we utilized BM25s (Lù, 2024). For the BM25 configuration, the overlap parameter was set to 50, and chunk_size was configured to 1000 for the experiments. The PMC-LLaMA model was quantized to half-precision, while the 70B model was quantized to 4-bit precision for experimentation. The implementation relied on the Transformers library (Wolf et al., 2020) and bitsandbytes (Dettmers et al., 2022). Across all experiments, the seed value was fixed at 42, and the max_length was set to 2048.

Model	Params	HuggingFace Name
Phi-3.5	3.8B	microsoft/Phi-3.5-mini-instruct
PMC-LLaMA	13B	axiong/PMC_LLAMA_13B
LLaMA2	70B	meta-llama/Llama-2-70b-chat-hf
MEDITRON	70B	epfl-llm/meditron-70b
LLaMA3.1	70B	meta-llama/Llama-3.1-70B
Contriever	1.1B	facebook/contriever
SPECTER	1.1B	allenai/specter
MedCPT	1.1B	ncbi/MedCPT-Query-Encoder

Table 6: Detailed name of models

A.3 Inference setting

In this study, as far as inference which needs to use GPUs, all experiments were conducted on a single NVIDIA RTX A6000 and NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 GPU.

⁶<https://huggingface.co/datasets/openlifescienceai/medmcqa>

⁷<https://github.com/jind11/MedQA>

⁸<https://github.com/MedMCQA/MedMCQA>

⁹<https://github.com/pubmedqa/pubmedqa>

¹⁰<https://github.com/hendrycks/test>

Retriever	Type	Size	Metric	Domain
BM25	Lexical	-	BM25	General
Contriever	Semantic	1.1B	IP	General
SPECTER	Semantic	1.1B	L2	Scientific
MedCPT	Semantic	1.1B	IP	Biomedical

Table 7: Detailed settings for retriever models.

A.4 Confidence Calibration Curve

The following presents additional results for Confidence Calibration. The **orange line** in the figures represents the case without RAG (w/o RAG), while the other lines correspond to the case with RAG.




Figure 7: The result of the confidence calibration curve with PMC-11ama and MMLU.




Figure 8: The result of the confidence calibration curve with LLaMA2 and MMLU.




Figure 9: The result of the confidence calibration curve with MEDITRON and MMLU.




Figure 10: The result of the confidence calibration curve with PMC-LLaMA and MedQA.




Figure 14: The result of the confidence calibration curve with PMC-LLaMA and MedMCQA.




Figure 11: The result of the confidence calibration curve with LLaMA2 and MedQA.




Figure 15: The result of the confidence calibration curve with LLaMA2 and MedQA.




Figure 12: The result of the confidence calibration curve with MEDITRON and MedQA.




Figure 16: The result of the confidence calibration curve with MEDITRON and MedQA.




Figure 13: The result of the confidence calibration curve with LLaMA3.1 and MedQA.




Figure 17: The result of the confidence calibration curve with LLaMA3.1 and MedQA.




Figure 18: The result of the confidence calibration curve with PMC-LLaMA and PubMedQA.




Figure 22: The result of the confidence calibration curve with Phi-3.5 and MMLU.




Figure 19: The result of the confidence calibration curve with LLaMA2 and PubMedQA.




Figure 23: The result of the confidence calibration curve with Phi-3.5 and PubMedQA.




Figure 20: The result of the confidence calibration curve with MEDITRON and PubMedQA.




Figure 24: The result of the confidence calibration curve with Phi-3.5 and MedMCQA.




Figure 21: The result of the confidence calibration curve with LLaMA3.1 and PubMedQA.




Figure 25: The result of the confidence calibration curve with Phi-3.5 and MedQA.

A.5 The Prompts

Below are examples of prompts with and without RAG. When RAG is applied, three patterns—Pre-Question, After-Question, and After-Choice—are used in our study.

Prompt without RAG

You are a helpful medical expert, and your task is to answer a multi-choice medical question using the relevant documents. Please first think step-by-step and then choose the answer from the provided options. Your responses will be used for research purposes only, so please have a definite answer.

Here is the question:

{question}

Here are the potential choices:

{choice0}

{choice1}

{choice2}

{choice3}

Answer:

Prompt with RAG

Here are the relevant documents: **(Pre-Question)**

{context}

You are a helpful medical expert, and your task is to answer a multi-choice medical question using the relevant documents. Please first think step-by-step and then choose the answer from the provided options. Your responses will be used for research purposes only, so please have a definite answer.

Here are the relevant documents: **(After-Question)**

{context}

Here is the question:

{question}

Here are the relevant documents: **(After-Choice)**

{context}

Here are the potential choices:

{choice0}

{choice1}

{choice2}

{choice3}

Answer:

MMLU							
Model	Retriever	Index	Accuracy \uparrow				
			None	T1-256	T1-512	T3-256	T3-512
Phi-3.5	w/o RAG	-	74.56	-	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	72.64	72.64	72.36	38.48
		textbooks	-	71.07	71.07	71.17	71.17
	Contriever	statpearls	-	71.72	71.72	71.81	71.81
		textbooks	-	71.53	71.44	71.90	71.72
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	72.73	72.73	72.45	72.45
		textbooks	-	72.36	72.45	71.99	71.90
	BM25	statpearls	-	70.62	70.62	71.26	71.26
		textbooks	-	70.52	70.52	71.90	71.90
	PMC-LLaMA	w/o RAG	-	24.43	-	-	-
MedCPT		statpearls	-	38.75	38.75	37.28	37.28
		textbooks	-	36.91	36.91	36.73	36.82
Contriever		statpearls	-	38.66	38.57	38.20	38.20
		textbooks	-	36.36	35.72	36.18	35.90
SPECTER		statpearls	-	38.02	38.02	37.28	37.28
		textbooks	-	37.83	37.83	34.89	34.99
BM25		statpearls	-	33.33	33.33	32.78	32.78
		textbooks	-	33.15	33.15	32.14	32.14
LLaMA-3.1		w/o RAG	-	72.64	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	33.24	33.15	32.87	32.87
		textbooks	-	32.87	32.78	32.78	32.69
	Contriever	statpearls	-	32.69	32.60	32.69	32.69
		textbooks	-	32.23	31.96	32.42	32.78
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	32.97	32.97	32.78	32.78
		textbooks	-	32.87	32.78	32.87	32.97
	BM25	statpearls	-	32.42	32.42	32.60	32.60
		textbooks	-	32.32	32.32	73.09	72.91
	MEDITRON	w/o RAG	-	42.15	-	-	-
MedCPT		statpearls	-	30.12	30.12	30.21	30.21
		textbooks	-	31.22	31.22	30.49	30.49
Contriever		statpearls	-	30.67	30.67	30.03	30.03
		textbooks	-	30.58	30.67	29.38	30.39
SPECTER		statpearls	-	31.04	31.04	31.40	31.40
		textbooks	-	32.23	32.23	31.68	31.68
BM25		statpearls	-	30.58	30.58	30.58	30.58
		textbooks	-	31.22	31.22	31.77	31.77
LLaMA-2		w/o RAG	-	49.95	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	34.25	34.25	34.34	34.34
		textbooks	-	34.80	34.80	35.45	35.45
	Contriever	statpearls	-	33.70	33.70	33.43	33.43
		textbooks	-	33.06	33.52	33.24	33.24
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	34.07	34.07	33.15	33.15
		textbooks	-	34.71	34.80	35.63	35.63
	BM25	statpearls	-	33.33	33.33	32.78	32.78
		textbooks	-	35.45	35.45	35.26	35.26

Table 8: The accuracy of results with MMLU.

MedMCQA												
Model	Retriever	Index	ECE ↓					ACE ↓				
			None	T1-256	T1-512	T3-256	T3-512	None	T1-256	T1-512	T3-256	T3-512
Phi-3.5	w/o RAG	-	0.05	-	-	-	-	0.06	-	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
		textbooks	-	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	-	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06
	Contriever	statpearls	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
		textbooks	-	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	-	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	-	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.08
		textbooks	-	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	-	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08
	BM25	statpearls	-	0.07	0.18	0.06	0.18	-	0.07	0.18	0.07	0.18
		textbooks	-	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	-	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06
	PMC-LLaMA	w/o RAG	-	0.16	-	-	-	-	0.16	-	-	-
MedCPT		statpearls	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	-	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.16
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.15	-	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.15
Contriever		statpearls	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.17	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.16	-	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.16
SPECTER		statpearls	-	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.15	-	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.15
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
BM25		statpearls	-	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26	-	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26
		textbooks	-	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.25	-	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
LLaMA-3.1		w/o RAG	-	0.20	-	-	-	-	0.20	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	0.30	0.30	0.29	0.29	-	0.30	0.30	0.29	0.29
		textbooks	-	0.21	0.30	0.21	0.30	-	0.21	0.30	0.21	0.30
	Contriever	statpearls	-	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	-	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21
		textbooks	-	0.19	0.19	0.20	0.20	-	0.19	0.19	0.20	0.20
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	-	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
		textbooks	-	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	-	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21
	BM25	statpearls	-	0.30	0.30	0.29	0.29	-	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
		textbooks	-	0.30	0.30	0.20	0.20	-	0.30	0.30	0.19	0.19
	MEDITRON	w/o RAG	-	0.07	-	-	-	-	0.06	-	-	-
MedCPT		statpearls	-	0.04	0.19	0.05	0.19	-	0.04	0.18	0.05	0.18
		textbooks	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
Contriever		statpearls	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
		textbooks	-	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	-	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03
SPECTER		statpearls	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	-	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04
		textbooks	-	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	-	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04
BM25		statpearls	-	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	-	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.19
		textbooks	-	0.19	0.19	0.18	0.18	-	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18
LLaMA-2		w/o RAG	-	0.02	-	-	-	-	0.02	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	0.02	0.21	0.20	0.20	-	0.02	0.21	0.19	0.19
		textbooks	-	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	-	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
	Contriever	statpearls	-	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	-	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02
		textbooks	-	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	-	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	-	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
		textbooks	-	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	-	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03
	BM25	statpearls	-	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.19	-	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.19
		textbooks	-	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	-	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19

Table 9: The ECE and ACE of results with MedMCQA.

PubMedQA												
Model	Retriever	Index	ECE ↓					ACE ↓				
			None	T1-256	T1-512	T3-256	T3-512	None	T1-256	T1-512	T3-256	T3-512
Phi-3.5	w/o RAG	-	0.48	-	-	-	-	0.48	-	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	0.29	0.29	0.33	0.33	-	0.29	0.29	0.33	0.33
		textbooks	-	0.43	0.43	0.42	0.42	-	0.43	0.43	0.42	0.42
	Contriever	statpearls	-	0.48	0.48	0.51	0.51	-	0.47	0.47	0.51	0.51
		textbooks	-	0.61	0.62	0.61	0.54	-	0.61	0.62	0.61	0.55
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	0.23	0.23	0.25	0.25	-	0.23	0.23	0.25	0.25
		textbooks	-	0.45	0.45	0.37	0.38	-	0.45	0.45	0.38	0.38
	BM25	statpearls	-	0.74	0.74	0.73	0.73	-	0.75	0.75	0.73	0.73
		textbooks	-	0.62	0.62	0.59	0.59	-	0.62	0.62	0.59	0.59
	PMC-LLaMA	w/o RAG	-	0.17	-	-	-	-	0.17	-	-	-
MedCPT		statpearls	-	0.08	0.08	0.16	0.16	-	0.08	0.08	0.15	0.15
		textbooks	-	0.20	0.20	0.23	0.23	-	0.20	0.20	0.22	0.22
Contriever		statpearls	-	0.09	0.09	0.12	0.12	-	0.09	0.09	0.13	0.13
		textbooks	-	0.19	0.18	0.12	0.13	-	0.18	0.17	0.12	0.13
SPECTER		statpearls	-	0.07	0.07	0.11	0.11	-	0.07	0.07	0.11	0.11
		textbooks	-	0.21	0.21	0.16	0.16	-	0.21	0.21	0.16	0.16
BM25		statpearls	-	0.06	0.06	0.15	0.15	-	0.06	0.06	0.15	0.15
		textbooks	-	0.25	0.25	0.19	0.19	-	0.25	0.25	0.19	0.19
LLaMA-3.1		w/o RAG	-	0.02	-	-	-	-	0.06	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	-	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33
		textbooks	-	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	-	0.32	0.32	0.33	0.33
	Contriever	statpearls	-	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	-	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33
		textbooks	-	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	-	0.33	0.33	0.34	0.34
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	-	0.33	0.33	0.32	0.32
		textbooks	-	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	-	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33
	BM25	statpearls	-	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31	-	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33
		textbooks	-	0.31	0.31	0.03	0.03	-	0.33	0.33	0.05	0.05
	MEDITRON	w/o RAG	-	0.18	-	-	-	-	0.18	-	-	-
MedCPT		statpearls	-	0.19	0.19	0.21	0.21	-	0.18	0.18	0.22	0.22
		textbooks	-	0.17	0.17	0.19	0.19	-	0.16	0.16	0.18	0.18
Contriever		statpearls	-	0.19	0.19	0.21	0.21	-	0.18	0.18	0.22	0.22
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.17	0.13	0.13	-	0.16	0.16	0.13	0.13
SPECTER		statpearls	-	0.16	0.16	0.18	0.18	-	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.17
		textbooks	-	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.15	-	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.16
BM25		statpearls	-	0.17	0.17	0.21	0.21	-	0.16	0.16	0.20	0.20
		textbooks	-	0.19	0.19	0.14	0.14	-	0.18	0.18	0.16	0.16
LLaMA-2		w/o RAG	-	0.12	-	-	-	-	0.12	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	-	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06
		textbooks	-	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.06	-	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.08
	Contriever	statpearls	-	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.03	-	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05
		textbooks	-	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.11	-	0.10	0.11	0.14	0.13
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	-	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
		textbooks	-	0.07	0.08	0.11	0.11	-	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.11
	BM25	statpearls	-	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.04	-	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.08
		textbooks	-	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	-	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07

Table 10: The ECE and ACE of results with PubMedQA.

MedQA												
Model	Retriever	Index	ECE ↓					ACE ↓				
			None	T1-256	T1-512	T3-256	T3-512	None	T1-256	T1-512	T3-256	T3-512
Phi-3.5	w/o RAG	-	0.30	-	-	-	-	0.33	-	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.06	-	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.07
		textbooks	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
	Contriever	statpearls	-	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
		textbooks	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	-	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.07
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
		textbooks	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
	BM25	statpearls	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
		textbooks	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	-	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
	PMC-LLaMA	w/o RAG	-	0.05	-	-	-	-	0.05	-	-	-
MedCPT		statpearls	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	-	0.16	0.16	0.14	0.14
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.15	0.14	0.14	-	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.14
Contriever		statpearls	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.17	0.15	0.15	-	0.15	0.16	0.15	0.15
SPECTER		statpearls	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	-	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15
		textbooks	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.15	-	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.15
BM25		statpearls	-	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	-	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27
		textbooks	-	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26	-	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26
LLaMA-3.1		w/o RAG	-	0.28	-	-	-	-	0.28	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	-	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27
		textbooks	-	0.28	0.28	0.27	0.27	-	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.27
	Contriever	statpearls	-	0.27	0.27	0.28	0.28	-	0.27	0.27	0.28	0.28
		textbooks	-	0.27	0.26	0.27	0.27	-	0.27	0.26	0.27	0.27
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	-	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27
		textbooks	-	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26	-	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26
	BM25	statpearls	-	0.31	0.31	0.30	0.30	-	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
		textbooks	-	0.31	0.31	0.28	0.28	-	0.30	0.30	0.28	0.28
	MEDITRON	w/o RAG	-	0.06	-	-	-	-	0.08	-	-	-
MedCPT		statpearls	-	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	-	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04
		textbooks	-	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	-	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03
Contriever		statpearls	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.05	-	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04
		textbooks	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.05	-	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.05
SPECTER		statpearls	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	-	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
		textbooks	-	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	-	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04
BM25		statpearls	-	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	-	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19
		textbooks	-	0.19	0.19	0.18	0.18	-	0.19	0.19	0.17	0.17
LLaMA-2		w/o RAG	-	0.03	-	-	-	-	0.03	-	-	-
	MedCPT	statpearls	-	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	-	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04
		textbooks	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	-	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05
	Contriever	statpearls	-	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	-	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.05
		textbooks	-	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.03	-	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.03
	SPECTER	statpearls	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
		textbooks	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	-	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
	BM25	statpearls	-	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.20	-	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.19
		textbooks	-	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.19	-	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19

Table 11: The ECE and ACE of results with MedQA.